it may spark latent qualities of firmness and leadership.

A successful game warden by nature is an individualist. He enjoys being his own boss, working out his own problems and the competition of matching wits with offenders of the law. He is not just a woods cop, although he must be a crafty manhunter, with the sleuthing ability of a city detective as well as a master craftsman in the woods. He must know the laws he enforces from A to Izzard and be something of a trial lawyer.

In this present day of automobiles and radio, he is beginning to lose affinity with nature; with the woods, fields, and waters. He hikes less, rides more and does not put forth the physical effort of his predecessors; seldom carries a pack or sleeps in the brush.

Too few wardens ever reach their full potential in their own field or the broader field of conservation. They fail through lack of hard work and diligence to master all the many ramifications of the work so necessary for success. This is equally true with other specialists. When a warden allows the job to become routine, he is either slipping or lacks imagination. There is no place for routine in game law enforcement. In addition to knowing all the tricks of the trade in enforcement, the warden should be well grounded in the biological field of fish and game, and have a working knowledge of forestry and land management. All these specialties develop him into the overall field man that he should be. By virtue of these additional attributes he will be less a cop and more of a conservationist; less sadistic and better balanced in humility and humor.

Above all, he must have an intense fever for his work, be fanatically conscientious, indifferent to hours, physical discomforts, poor pay, and public abuse. Many are called, some are chosen, but too few really succeed. There is no better job in the entire field of conservation upon which to build decision and judgment for all specialties than some basic training in law enforcement.

## The Post-Dispatch on Contempt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1963*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session of the Congress, I introduced a bill designed to make more fair the procedures in use for citing individuals for contempt of Congress. I believe our rules are weak in this area for we allow, in the normal case, the same committee of the Congress to be victim, prosecutor, and first judge of the contempt. I question whether a similar procedure instituted in a court of law would meet the requirements of due process.

In an editorial on February 1, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch takes note of my proposal and adds its support to it. I am very pleased that they have done so for I believe this is one of the procedural reforms which can help bring the Congress into better shape to perform its assigned tasks. I especially commend the Post-Dispatch's emphasis on the help this proposal could provide to the Congress. Aside from the very important benefits to those who are charged with contempt, a sounder procedure for the handling of congressional contempt citations will make this form of protection for the Congress far more meaningful. I would urge that the fullest consideration be given this proposal and I am placing the St. Louis-Dispatch editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to help explain more fully the purpose and the scope of this bill.

The article follows:

MR. CURTIS' SOUND BILL

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS has offered a bill to revise contempt-of-Congress procedures which we think Congress might well accept. What the Webster Groves Republican offers is a simple change: to establish a kind of screening committee to consider requests for contempt citations from other committees and to refer them to the House or Senate for action if that seems advisable.

Mr. CURTIS points out that the two busy Chambers are hard pressed to consider thoroughly contempt charges offered by various committees. The temptation may be to accept the committee's word for instituting proceedings, but in such cases, the committee is acting as both the injured party and the prosecutor. What is needed is a separate committee to serve as a kind of grand jury, and to give contempt charges the kind of objective study they are unlikely to get from a committee that feels it has been treated contemptuously.

The Curtis proposal would improve the fairness of the contempt proceeding; it might also help Congress. In its last session, the Supreme Court set aside contempt convictions of nine men because the indictments did not state the subject under inquiry when the men were questioned. To some extent this may have been the fault of officers who drew up the indictments, but it is also true that committees on general probing and exposure expeditions sometimes are not certain as to what they are investigating. In such cases, contempt actions can be a waste of time. A committee as suggested by Mr. CURTIS, which might screen out baseless actions would strengthen Congress power to use the contempt proceeding to protect itself.

## Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Thursday, February 14, 1963*

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in a radio broadcast this week I asked some questions that are of grave concern to the residents of the First Wisconsin District and, indeed, to all Americans. Under unanimous consent, I raise those questions here because of the interest of our colleagues in the Congress in this subject and with the hope that someone occupying a position of trust in the White House, or someone with an unclogged pipeline to the White House, will come through with the answers.

Text of the broadcast follows:

Something new has been added to the normally heavy mail load coming into my Washington office. People back home are not only stating their views, they are asking questions. The subject is Cuba. And they're asking questions they should never have had to ask, for information to which they are entitled. They're confused, and small wonder. So are the Members of the Congress.

There are two general areas of confusion and uncertainty. One is of the extent of the continuing Soviet Communist threat in Cuba, centered around what has—or what has not—taken place in Cuba since the President, last October 22, announced the quarantine of Cuba. It has to do with a documented clarification of the military and missile situation in Cuba as it is today. The other has to do with the "deal" to ransom the Bay of Pigs prisoners.

In the next few minutes I want to direct my remarks to the latter category, the payment of blackmail to the Cuban Communist dictator, Castro. Citizens in the First Wisconsin District have written me for information. A survey of their letters indicates that they want to know whether or not our Government is involved, along with private firms and individuals, in this ransom deal, and if so, to what extent?

If the Government is involved, it should not be classified information. Why isn't the public told outright all the facts?

If the Government is not involved, what right do private citizens have to deal with foreign governments?

What is or will be the effect of this action on foreign policy and foreign relations, not alone with Cuba but with other nations?

Did the Central Intelligence Agency underwrite the ransom payment? If it did, by how much?

Has any portion of the payment gone to the Soviet Union?

What concessions, if any, did the Internal Revenue Service make to the contributors?

What concessions, if any, did the Justice Department make in connection with the ransom contributions?

What concessions, if any, did other Federal agencies make in connection with the ransom contributions? Such as the Agriculture Department; the State Department; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Is it true that the drug firms involved not only obtained tax concessions but actually sold their products at wholesale?

If the drug firms made a profit, how much?

Did the first payment of ransom by the United States in its history damage U.S. prestige in other countries?

Did not the United States admit to Communist Fidel Castro's continued authority in Cuba by paying a ransom to him just after he had helped the Kremlin try to get an atomic "drop" on us?

Did not payment of this U.S. ransom hasten the fetters of slavery tighter on the helpless Cuban people?

It's reprehensible that citizens of this free and open society are not given—without asking for it—all the information to which they are entitled.

It is my conviction that an appropriate committee on the House call in American officials involved—Attorney General Robert Kennedy, for one—as well as the U.S. firms and other key figures so that the public can be properly informed, for, after all, what we are doing or failing to do in our relationship with Cuba affects each and every one of us personally.

One of the great dangers confronting free people is secrecy on the part of governments where nonclassified matters are concerned. Secrecy creates suspicions, which do much to destroy the faith of the people in even good governments.

This particular action—the Cuban ransom deal—is shrouded in a heavy mist of secrecy. Knowledge is withheld from even those who are elected to represent the people. The people have a right to know the facts, and I call on the proper officials of the executive branch of the Government to provide them.